

City Council Meeting Minutes

**May 21, 2019
City Hall, Council Chambers
749 Main Street
7:00 PM**

Call to Order – Mayor Muckle called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Roll Call was taken and the following members were present:

City Council: ***Mayor Robert Muckle
Mayor Pro Tem Jeff Lipton
Councilmember Jay Keany
Councilmember Chris Leh
Councilmember Susan Loo
Councilmember Dennis Maloney
Councilmember Ashley Stolzmann***

Absent: ***Councilmember Jay Keany***

Staff Present: ***Heather Balser, City Manager
Megan Davis, Deputy City Manager
Kurt Kowar, Public Works Director
Nathan Mosley, Parks, Recreation & Open Space Director
Rob Zuccaro, Planning & Building Safety Director
Felicity Solvoski, Planner I
Meredyth Muth, City Clerk***

Others Present: ***Kathleen Kelly, City Attorney***

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All rose for the pledge of allegiance.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mayor Muckle called for changes to the agenda and hearing none, moved to approve the agenda, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Lipton. All in favor.

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None.

APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA

MOTION: Mayor Muckle stated item D will be removed from the agenda and put on the regular agenda so it can be continued to May 28. Mayor Muckle moved to approve the consent agenda, seconded by Councilmember Loo . All in favor.

- A. Approval of Bills
- B. Approval of Minutes: May 7, 2019
- C. Approval of City Council Special Meeting on May 28, 2019
- D. Award Bid for Powerline Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon Project and Approve Contract Amendment Between the City of Louisville and Sustainable Traffic Solutions for the Powerline Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon Project – *moved to regular agenda*
- E. Approve Contribution for Boulder County Homeless Services

COUNCIL INFORMATIONAL COMMENTS ON PERTINENT ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Mayor Muckle stated he and City Manager Balser and Director DeJong just returned from the International Council of Shopping Centers and had good conversations with developers with projects or proposed projects in town. It was a productive trip.

CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

City Manager Balser stated the Library's Summer Reading program kicks off next week. Memory Square Pool is scheduled to open May 25 if it is warm enough. The Police Department and Ascent Community Church helped with a community clean-up of the mobile home park; it was a great success and continued to a second day.

REGULAR BUSINESS

AWARD BID FOR POWERLINE PEDESTRIAN HYBRID BEACON PROJECT AND APPROVE CONTRACT AMENDMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF LOUISVILLE AND SUSTAINABLE TRAFFIC SOLUTIONS FOR THE POWERLINE PEDESTRIAN HYBRID BEACON PROJECT – *moved from consent agenda*

Mayor Muckle moved continue this item to May 28, Councilmember Loo seconded.

Voice vote: all in favor.

ORDINANCE NO. 1773, SERIES 2019 – AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE PAYMENT OF CITY MONEYS FOR THE CITY'S ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY

**LEGALLY DESCRIBED AS OUTLOT A, DAVIDSON HIGHLINE SUBDIVISION
REPLAT 2 – 2nd READING, PUBLIC HEARING (advertised *Daily Camera* 4/12/19)**

Mayor Muckle moved to continue this item to June 4; Councilmember Maloney seconded.

Voice Vote: all in favor.

**RESOLUTION NO. 17, SERIES 2019 – A RESOLUTION REPEALING RESOLUTIONS
IMPLEMENTING THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUND BY REENACTING INTO A
SINGLE RESOLUTION INCORPORATING ALL PREVIOUS RESOLUTIONS,
PROVIDING UPDATES FOR THE RECENT BALLOT MEASURE, AND INCREASING
CERTAIN INCENTIVES**

Mayor Muckle introduced the item by title.

Planner Solvoski stated some changes were made to the language in the resolution and copies were available on the dais. The Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) has been reviewing the historic preservation program specifically to look at what the maximum amounts should be for historic structure assessments, residential grants, and commercial grants; are there ways to simplify the grant process; how to eliminate barriers to land-marking; how to make the program more user-friendly; should there be an update to the new construction grant criteria to match the alteration certificate language; how should changes apply to previously landmarked properties; and is this an incentive to landmark or a way to facilitate maintenance.

Staff surveyed local architects and contractors who have worked in the program to better understand the cost of preservation projects. The feedback staff got was the grants need to be increased to be useful. Staff and the HPC are recommending increasing the grant levels for both commercial and residential grants. Solvoski reviewed the specific grant levels being proposed for each type of grant and other changes to the program including higher funding amounts available, allowing a grant for new construction for residential properties, new criteria for the grants, and new timelines for grants

Solvoski stated the current balance of the fund is estimated at almost \$2M. Average revenue over the last three years is \$731,000 annually. For future revenues 80% goes into the Historic Preservation Fund and 20% into museum operations. Administrative costs average \$140,000 annually. Over the next 10 years of the grant, staff estimates additional available funds of approximately \$5.9M.

With the updated incentives, staff's target is four new residential landmarks and one commercial landmark annually for the next 10 years. If all properties maximize their grants, this would result in expenditures of \$5,650,000 from the Historic Preservation Fund. In addition, funds need to be maintained for the revolving loan program. Staff finds the estimated revenue over the next 10 years is adequate to fund grants at the proposed levels and maintain an additional \$1-2 million for the revolving loan fund.

Staff recommends approval of Resolution No. 17 as amended.

Councilmember Stolzmann asked about contributing structures and how they play into the total. Solvoski stated there are no changes for \$50K for a conservation easement on structures of merit. None of the other grants affect structures of merit.

Councilmember Maloney asked how does staff see these changes incentivizing people to use the program. Solvoski stated many people are interested in the grants at this new level. Staff would also look at reaching out to anyone with a property that would qualify. The HPC will market the program more and these numbers should make people take note.

Councilmember Maloney wondered if there is a way for the council to approve something above these numbers. Solvoski stated yes with extraordinary circumstances.

Councilmember Maloney asked about the two story limit which is new on the commercial new construction criteria. Solvoski noted language could be added to talk about maintaining height.

Mayor Muckle stated there are some historic structures taller than two stories that would not be constrained by new construction. Councilmember Maloney noted he was thinking of those structures where they might want to augment with new construction.

Councilmember Loo asked if we have ever turned down a request for landmarking. Director Zuccaro stated there was one that applied for landmarking but didn't meet the criteria so it was named a structure of merit and got a conservation easement instead. Councilmember Loo asked if anyone has been turned down for funding. Director Zuccaro stated not that came to Council but some may never get past the staff discussion stage.

Councilmember Loo asked if staff is screening applications. Director Zuccaro stated the vast majority of conversations are to encourage landmarking, not discourage it. If someone came forward and didn't meet the criteria staff might discourage the application.

Councilmember Loo asked how many residential landmarkings per year we have had on average. Solvoski stated three per year over the last five years.

Councilmember Loo asked if the unmatched preservation grant of \$10K could be used for anything and is not limited to preservation work. Solvoski stated the HPC wanted to have a bonus as an incentive and the \$10K is intended for that. So yes, it could be used for anything if you landmark. The HPC had extensive debate about this; they wanted a big aggressive incentive. Director Zuccaro noted there is an incentive now, it is just a much lower amount. Staff is open to feedback on this amount.

Councilmember Loo would like the language for mechanical, electrical and plumbing systems clarified; she did not want to be paying for high end fixtures for example. Solvoski noted it had to be used for bringing those things up to code. Director Zuccaro stated the grants only reimburse approved improvements noted in the grant request and in the historic structure assessment (HSA).

Councilmember Loo asked why choose the timelines of 36 months and 60 months. Solvoski stated the work is based on the HSA and if there is a long time between the assessment and the application we don't know if it is still accurate. Councilmember Loo stated she would like it shorter. Solvoski stated the HPC felt 36 seemed to be reasonable and it would alleviate giving people extensions which has been an issue.

Councilmember Loo stated she thinks the loan interest rate is very low. Solvoski stated it is low to get people to use it. Councilmember Loo asked if there are safeguards against losing our money. Solvoski stated there is a standard process for a lien on the property so we would get the money back at sale.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton stated it is bold and aggressive, perhaps too much. He asked what other communities are doing. Solvoski stated we are unique in having this fund. As far as we know no other municipality has such a fund.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton asked how the numbers were determined. Director Zuccaro stated staff looked at the cost of construction and the historic structure assessment eligible work and tried to derive numbers from that. There were also a few recent large projects asking for extraordinary circumstances because the eligible items far exceeded the current maximum. Mayor Pro Tem Lipton asked if in those case studies, what percentage the new numbers would cover. Solvoski stated there is no typical project and the City may never see the final cost of the projects as it is not required.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton stated renovation might be \$150K and a resident could get \$70K from the City, we would be paying the majority of the project. Director Zuccaro said he anticipates even if we adopt this at \$50K many applicants will only be able to apply for a portion of that as eligible costs.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton stated for the HSA grants he likes the increases to help people get them into the program. The revolving loan fund is a fairly low interest rate, he is not sure we need to go that low.

Public Comments – None.

Councilmember Stolzmann is generally in favor of this approach, it is a step to getting some people who might not otherwise save their home rather than scraping it. The other numbers were not high enough to do that. This would allow more funding without using the extraordinary circumstances and is more clear and fair. For the loan rate, it does need to be a subprime rate to get people to use it. We should task the HPC with looking at the

opportunity to buy a property, landmark it, and then be able to sell it. We should have a ranked list for what we want to buy similar to how we rank open space properties.

Mayor Muckle agreed with Councilmember Stolzmann. We are ready for the program to be bold and aggressive, the worst outcome is to landmark more structures.

Councilmember Maloney stated we do want to be more aggressive. We have a finite number of historic structure and we want to preserve as many as possible. He supports the changes for higher levels of grants to get people interested. He feels the loan rate is fine as proposed. He will support it as written. Mayor Muckle agreed.

Councilmember Loo stated this is just a slush fund. A \$10K incentive is much too high if there is no requirement to use it on the structure. She cannot support it with that in the resolution. Councilmember Loo agreed below prime for the loan is good, but 3% is too much. We should target properties we want to save to make sure we have enough funding to cover those. This is way too generous a program for using tax-payer money.

Councilmember Leh stated he shares the concern about how aggressive this is however the taxpayers of town have said they want this. The HPC put a great deal of effort into this with a lot of thoughtful work. He wonders if there is a reason to be less aggressive to keep more money in the fund. He is not as concerned about the 10K incentive and it doesn't need to be tied to work. It is not likely to lead to a rush on the fund. Inclined to support it as written.

Mayor Muckle moved to approve Resolution No. 17, Series 2019, Councilmember Stolzmann seconded.

Discussion of motion.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton felt it is important to stimulate reinvestment in this area to keep the homes and buildings from being functionally obsolete, but this is too aggressive. He is fine with HSA and with the landmark incentive, but would prefer using smaller increases to start with so as not to give too much. Just give enough to stimulate more interest if that doesn't work we can increase again in a few years. It is a hard sell to those who live in newer homes and don't have access to these funds. He stated he can't approve it as written, but is interested in some changes.

Councilmember Stolzmann asked Mayor Pro Tem Lipton what levels he would support. Mayor Pro Tem Lipton stated he would need to go line by line to look at each grant.

Mayor Muckle stated he would like to have the problem that we are spending more money or we are using it too fast. He would like to have the problem of more people landmarking. He prefers aggressive now than the other way around.

Councilmember Loo stated rather than giving the \$10K incentive she would be interested in cutting to \$5K; she would like to see the HSA grant lower, maybe \$2500. The rest she can support.

Councilmember Maloney stated residents have voted on this twice with very strong support, from his perspective renovations of historic homes are expensive. The incentives will be more aggressive and that is what he would like to see.

Councilmember Loo stated people are supportive of the concept of the program but when looking at these levels of funding there will be an outcry.

Councilmember Leh stated maybe it makes sense to go a little slower. He asked if three landmarkings per year is considered a success. Would residents be happy knowing only three per year are completed and how are we going to meet that goal. This may get us there, is there any appetite for going more slowly on certain pieces of this. This is a program that is incredibly unusual and is a signature program of the City. It would help for Council to be 100% behind it.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton proposed a substitute motion to approve the resolution as drafted with changing the HSA maximum of \$4K residential and \$9K commercial, to incentives at \$5K residential, \$50K commercial, and on the revolving loan change it to 2% below prime. Councilmember Loo seconded.

Director Zuccaro stated if there is a decrease in the commercial grant it is less than current grant, perhaps transfer the \$25K to the matching grant. Mayor Pro Tem Lipton and Councilmember Loo accepted the change.

Director Zuccaro wanted to clarify the new construction grant for residential structures is a nonmatching grant. Motioner and seconder agreed.

Councilmember Stolzmann did not support the motion and wants to require matching for new construction. She felt the additional money for commercial without the match was meant as an incentive. Councilmember Loo clarified, match on residential and no match on commercial. She supported that as did Mayor Pro Tem Lipton.

Director Zuccaro said the commercial grants would give unmatched land-marking grant of \$50,000 and matching preservation grant increase to \$150,000.

Vote on intervening motion.

Voice vote: all in favor.

AWARD BID FOR 2019 WATER MAIN REPLACEMENT

Director Kowar stated this is consideration of a construction contract with Brannan Construction for approximately \$1.5M for water main replacements. This is a significant change from the budget for this project. New areas were added to the project where we are having frequent breaks, Eisenhower and Ridge View. For these areas the risk outweighs the wait. Staff feels this is worth the additional cost and the extra cost is built into the current rate structure.

Councilmember Stolzmann stated the Utility Committee has reviewed this and asked staff to move ahead with the design phase including all areas. When the costs were reviewed after bids, we found the reserve can handle the extra costs and have enough in reserve to address the frequent breaks in these areas. We need to continue to look at all projects to see if we want to move any projects to other years.

Mayor Muckle noted this will not affect utility rates as there is enough working capital to do this project. Councilmember Stolzmann noted there is a built in rate increase.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton asked if we can move or delay other projects and keep within the rate model increases. Director Kowar stated that is the case and we are over performing on the rate model, however, it is running lean so there should to be careful consideration of needs versus wants.

Councilmember Maloney stated along Eisenhower we have corrosive soils due to the iron pipes; are there other areas with that issue. Director Kowar stated yes, the majority of the City has iron pipe. Some has been replaced with construction and it is hard to predict where problems might occur. This particular area just got thin enough it needs replacing.

Public Comments – None

Mayor Muckle moved to award the 2019 Water Main Replacement to Brannan Construction for \$1,571,619.84, authorize staff to execute change orders up to \$150,000.00 for additional work and project contingency, and authorize the Mayor, Public Works Director and City Clerk to sign and execute contract documents on behalf of the City and award an additional \$45,000.00 to A.G. Wassenaar, Inc. for geotechnical services for the project. Councilmember Loo second.

Vote: Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

DISCUSSION/DIRECTION/ACTION – PROCEDURE FOR FILING AND PROCESSING A COMPLAINT AGAINST AN APPOINTED OFFICIAL

Clerk Muth stated the Legal Review Committee and staff have been working on creating a process by which a member of the public may submit a formal complaint against any of the City's appointed officials. While there is no requirement the City have such a process, the Legal Committee feels it is important the City have something in place should the need arise.

The appointed officials are the City Manager, Municipal Judge, the Prosecuting Attorney, the City Attorney, and Water Attorney. Each of these officials reports directly to the City Council and are not included in the City's employee complaint process handled by the Human Resources Department.

She reviewed the proposed process:

1. A written complaint is submitted to the Mayor or any member of the City Council.
2. Should the complaint be about the Municipal Judge, Prosecuting Attorney, or City Manager the Councilmember will give the complaint to the City Attorney to process. Should the complaint be about the City Attorney, the Councilmember will give the complaint to the Prosecuting Attorney to process.
3. Upon receipt, an independent, third-party factfinder ("Reviewer") shall be engaged to determine whether the facts as alleged by the Complainant warrant an investigation.
4. If the Reviewer determines a Complaint should be dismissed, the City Council and the Complaining Party will be notified of such determination.
5. If the Reviewer determines the Complaint warrants an investigation, the subject of the Complaint will be notified of the Complaint.
6. Before completing the investigation, the Reviewer shall provide the officer against whom the Complaint is made an opportunity to provide information concerning the Complaint.
7. Following the investigation, the Reviewer shall report to the City Council the findings of the investigation and the Complaining Party will be informed the investigation has been completed.

Councilmember Leh noted it is important to handle any complaints in an orderly and consistent manner. The confidentiality is important to the extent the law permits. There is an anti-retaliation clause included as well. The Legal Committee recommends approval.

Councilmember Maloney asked if someone independent would be hired for each complaint received. He wondered if it could be reviewed initially by the city attorney to determine if it is frivolous.

Councilmember Leh noted it is fairly typical to have someone outside do the review. These type of investigations can be very simple and the idea is for anything meritorious to go forward and the ones without merit to be weeded out.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton asked how the reviewer would present to City Council; would it be a public session. Mayor Muckle and City Attorney Kelly noted it would be a reason for an executive session.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton moved to approve the proposed complaint process as submitted in the packet. Councilmember Stolzmann seconded.

Voice vote: all in favor.

DISCUSSION/DIRECTION/ACTION – ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCESSES FOR APPOINTED OFFICIALS

MUNICIPAL JUDGE, PROSECUTING ATTORNEY, CITY ATTORNEY, AND WATER ATTORNEY

Clerk Muth stated the Legal Review Committee and staff have been working on a process for evaluations of each of the City's appointed officials. This item covers the Municipal Judge, the Prosecuting Attorney, the City Attorney, and the Water Attorney while the City Manager process is handled separately. Each of these officials reports directly to the City Council and are not included in the City's evaluation process for staff.

These officials each have a two-year contract and can be reappointed for an additional two years if Council so desires. The current contract for each position ends December 31, 2019.

Muth stated the evaluations vary a bit by position but they all include some review by City Council or the Legal Committee, staff evaluations, and self-evaluations. All of those evaluations will be reviewed by the Legal Committee which will then make a recommendation to Council to reappoint or not.

Following the reviews if the City Council decides not to reappoint any of the officials, staff would begin a process to recruit candidates to apply beginning in 2020. Any such process would include a Request for Proposals from the City, applications from interested parties, interviews by the Legal Committee, and a hiring recommendation by the Committee to the City Council. All of that would need to be completed by the end of this year.

Councilmember Leh noted the Council does appoint all of these positions and there has not been a formal process for evaluation.

Councilmember Maloney felt this was the right kind of tool for evaluations before any reappointments. He asked about the process for the water attorney and asked if the Utility Committee could fill out the same form.

Councilmember Leh noted the reason the Legal Committee did not ask for that was the Utility Committee might not have enough granular information the form asks for. Councilmember Maloney said he thought of that as well but thought if that information was not available the committee could just state that on the form. Staff will add that to the process.

Muth noted there were two rating scales proposed for the water attorney and city attorney and the Legal Committee would like Council input on which one to use.

Councilmember Leh reviewed the two rating scales. Mayor Pro Tem Lipton preferred alternative #2. Councilmember Loo agreed and suggested adding a no opinion and do not know. She suggested taking out the second sentence on question #3 “Work is of high quality in all significant areas of responsibility.” Councilmember Stolzmann was okay with leaving that sentence in.

Councilmember Len moved to approve the evaluation procedure and forms including submitting the staff form to the Utility Committee, adopting the alternative rating scale with striking the second sentence of #3 and adding no opinion and do not know to the scale. Councilmember Loo seconded.

Voice vote: all in favor.

CITY MANAGER

Deputy City Manager Davis stated the Louisville Charter and the City Manager’s annual employment contract state the City Council shall evaluate the City Manager’s performance annually. The current City Manager’s contract indicates the next City Manager evaluation should occur in April 2020. A mutually agreed-upon process for evaluation of the City Manager is a key component and best practice of any well-run local government. In 2019, City Council developed an evaluation instrument and process to fulfill this requirement, to provide the City Manager with performance feedback and guidance on Council’s performance goals for the coming year. City Council would like to formalize the annual City Manager evaluation process by establishing a regular timeline and consistent approach to be utilized in future years.

After receiving feedback from Council on the 2019 evaluation process, Councilmembers Maloney and Loo worked with staff on recommendations to formalize the process for incorporation into the regular work plan and advanced agenda moving forward. Having a regular process in place will help the City Manager and Council adequately plan for the time and resources necessary to complete the evaluation process. The 2020 process would include the following components:

- Evaluation Instrument
- Facilitated process
- 360 Evaluation
- City Council Evaluation Session
- Contract review

Staff recommends City Council determine which version of the assessment instrument is preferred, and approve the proposed 2020 City Manager evaluation process.

Councilmember Maloney stated the changes are fairly minor in the two tools. A weighting tool was added to the areas of focus and the other was formatting to make the questions more clear to look at all facets of items.

Councilmember Stolzmann stated she had concerns about the online tool. She stated this year's online process was not user friendly and thought the paper version more useful.

Councilmember Maloney was not opposed to that idea. He asked for input on the way the weighting was done. He noted the second form changes to simplify and have fewer categories.

Councilmember Maloney recommended the rating scale on the first evaluation form which would be consistent with the scale for the other direct reports but the second form with the fewer categories for the evaluation.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton would like to use the same wording from the Legal Committee rating scale just approved. Councilmember Maloney agreed to that.

Councilmember Stolzmann stated perhaps there should not be weighting, she is not sure that brings much to the process and supports removing them. Councilmember Maloney stated with the creation of areas of focus, the weighting helps reinforce those areas. Mayor Muckle agreed with Councilmember Stolzmann the weighting is not productive.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton stated the use of weights does provide guidance to the employee by showing them what areas to emphasize. This sets up the performance plan to give the employee enough information to focus their efforts.

Councilmember Loo said the important thing is Council has a session to discuss the tool and its use as you start the process; define what the rating scale actually means so everyone is using it the same way. This is a tool to start a conversation.

Deputy City Manager Davis noted that built into the process for next year is more time with the facilitator up front to do these things.

Mayor Muckle agreed to use the second form and the rating scale the same as the other direct reports.

Councilmember Stolzmann asked if Council can commit to do the weighting details before the process begins and not use the online tool. Councilmember Loo agreed the online tool did not work well.

Mayor Muckle stated it can be done electronically, but not use the tool. Maybe a Word document that is emailed.

Members agreed to discuss the percentages and weighting another time. Members agreed to the process with those changes.

**DISCUSSION/DIRECTION – RECONSIDERATION OF PROCESS TO FILL
REVITALIZATION COMMISSION MIDYEAR VACANCIES**

Mayor Muckle asked if Council wanted to reconsider the vacancies. He stated it should be reconsidered as we have things we want the Louisville Revitalization Commission (LRC) to do and having a full complement would be useful. He suggested those who did the interviews should discuss the remaining applicants from the February interviews to see if any should be moved forward.

Councilmember Maloney stated the reason to reconsider this is to assure we have enough people to have a quorum at meetings.

Councilmember Stolzmann didn't feel more people are needed for a quorum. We are only down one member. We should only discuss appointing to one position. It's not worth the effort to appoint to the second position as it is less than six months from the time of the vacancy to the next appointment process.

Councilmember Leh stated he supports filling both positions now as circumstances have changed. Council has charged the LRC with work to do and we need to have a full crew for that purpose. Generally six months is great, under these circumstances it is not.

Councilmember Loo agreed with Councilmember Maloney to fill the one vacancy and have it done in June.

There was general agreement to have the discussion of the appointment at the June 4 meeting.

**ORDINANCE NO. 1774, SERIES 2019 – AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 1.28
OF THE LOUISVILLE MUNICIPAL CODE CONCERNING INCARCERATION OF
MUNICIPAL OFFENDERS – 1ST READING, SET PUBLIC HEARING 6/4/19**

City Attorney Kelly introduced the ordinance by title. Mayor Pro Tem Lipton moved to approve Ordinance No. 1774, Series 2019 on first reading, order it published and set the public hearing for June 4, 2019, Mayor Muckle seconded the motion.

Councilmember Stolzmann stated she is interested in discussing during second reading decreasing or eliminating incarceration for municipal offenses.

Voice vote: all in favor.

**ORDINANCE NO. 1775, SERIES 2019 – AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER
17.56 OF THE LOUISVILLE MUNICIPAL CODE TO ADOPT UPDATED FLOOD
INSURANCE RATE MAPS AND TO ADD PENALTY PROVISIONS FOR VIOLATIONS –
1ST READING, SET PUBLIC HEARING 7/9/19**

City Attorney Kelly introduced the ordinance by title. Mayor Muckle moved to approve Ordinance No. 1775, Series 2019 on first reading, order it published and set the public hearing for July 9, 2019, Mayor Pro Tem Lipton seconded the motion.

Voice vote: all in favor.

CITY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

None.

COUNCIL COMMENTS, COMMITTEE REPORTS, AND IDENTIFICATION OF FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Councilmember Maloney stated the Finance Committee sees that sales tax revenue is decreasing and flattening out. This year we are trending below projections and it could be off by as much as \$1M for 2019, dependent on various factors. We are going to have to factor that into our budgeting. The Finance Committee also reviewed the Rec Center dash boards; revenue and attendance is way up, perhaps enough to lower the General Fund transfer. The ballot language for the TABOR question is coming June 4th for discussion. The impact fee for the Rec Center no longer applies and can be used for other construction projects for the building that were value engineered out in the build process.

ADJOURN

Members adjourned at 9:30 pm.

Robert P. Muckle, Mayor

Meredyth Muth, City Clerk